

## MINUTES

### STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Ladislaus B. Dombrowski Board Room

John A. Hannah Building  
608 West Allegan  
Lansing, Michigan

March 14, 2006  
9:30 a.m.

Present: Mrs. Kathleen N. Straus, President  
Mr. John C. Austin, Vice President  
Mrs. Carolyn L. Curtin, Secretary  
Mrs. Marianne Yared McGuire, Treasurer  
Mrs. Nancy Danhof, NASBE Delegate  
Mrs. Elizabeth W. Bauer  
Mr. Reginald M. Turner  
Mrs. Eileen Lappin Weiser  
Ms. Sue Carnell, representing Governor Jennifer M. Granholm,  
ex officio

Also Present: Mr. Daniel Schab, 2005-2006 Michigan Teacher of the Year

Absent: Mr. Michael P. Flanagan, Chairman

### **REGULAR MEETING**

#### **I. CALL TO ORDER**

Mrs. Straus, President, called the Regular Meeting to order at 9:45 a.m. She said Mr. Flanagan is participating on a panel at the "Global Leaders Conference" in Washington by invitation of Microsoft. She said he is the only American educator invited. She explained that the Board By-Laws state that in the Chairman's absence, the President will preside at the meeting.

#### **II. AGENDA FOLDER ITEMS**

- A. MEAP Statewide Results (Related to Item B)
- B. Social Studies Grade Level Content Expectations Development Process Update (Related to Item P)

III. INFORMATIONAL FOLDER ITEMS

- A. Information on Standards for Determining a Bona Fide Year-Round School
- B. Information on Nominations to the Special Education Advisory Committee

IV. APPROVAL OF AGENDA AND ORDER OF PRIORITY

- A. Approval of State Board of Education Strategic Goal and Priorities – added to agenda

Mrs. Danhof requested the following modification to the agenda:

- B. Approval of State Educational Technology Plan – removed from consent agenda and placed under discussion

**Mr. Turner moved, seconded by Mrs. Curtin, that the State Board of Education approve the agenda and order of priority, as modified.**

**Ayes: Bauer, Curtin, Danhof, Straus, Turner**  
**Absent: Austin, McGuire, Weiser**

**The motion carried.**

V. INTRODUCTION OF STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MEMBERS, DEPARTMENT STAFF, AND GUESTS

Mrs. Eileen Hamilton, State Board Executive, introduced members of the State Board of Education, Department staff, and guests.

Mrs. Hamilton said new employees will be introduced at the Board meetings, beginning with today's meeting. She introduced Mr. David Head, Office of Communications; and Mr. Mark Bouvy, Office of Financial Management.

VI. RECESS

The Board recessed the Regular Meeting to convene as a Committee of the Whole at 9:50 a.m.

## **COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE MEETING**

### **VII. CALL TO ORDER**

Mrs. Straus called the Committee of the Whole Meeting to order at 9:51 a.m.

### **VIII. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

#### **A. Update on Supporting Student Behavior: Standards for the Emergency Use of Seclusion and Restraint and Recommended Strategic Directives**

The following individuals presented:

- Dr. Jacquelyn Thompson, Director, Office of Special Education and Early Intervention Services
- Ms. Joanne Winkelman, Coordinator, Office of Special Education and Early Intervention Services
- Ms. Cheryl Diamond, Consultant, Office of Special Education and Early Intervention Services

At the October 2005 State Board of Education meeting, staff presented a draft of the Supporting Student Behavior: Standards for the Emergency Use of Seclusion and Restraint. At that meeting the Board asked staff to research and compare information from selected states regarding seclusion and restraint policies. The information was provided in the materials provided to the Board, and the document applies to all students.

Mr. Flanagan joined the meeting from 9:55 a.m. to 10:00 a.m. via telephone. Mrs. McGuire joined the meeting at 9:55 a.m.; Mr. Austin at 10:05 a.m.; and Mrs. Weiser at 10:15 a.m.

State Representative Alexander Lipsey, addressed the Board. He also spoke at the October 11, 2005, Board meeting, because this is an issue of deep concern to him and his constituents. He said he supports the Board's proposed policy, he believes the Board is committed to addressing the issue, and he hopes the Legislature will also take action. He said he does not believe a school district must adopt Positive Behavior Supports as a prerequisite for addressing seclusion and restraint. He said both issues are important, but they are independent. He said the proposed policy states that two appropriately-trained staff must be involved while using seclusion. He said work must also be done addressing the contact of first responders from outside the building. He said it is his understanding that the area used for

seclusion will not be locked. He said teacher preparation institutions must provide training in seclusion and restraint.

Board member comments and staff clarifications included:

1. only four states were mentioned, were all states reviewed – initially all states were reviewed with regard to education, four states were highlighted because they were previously mentioned in public comment;
2. do any states prohibit seclusion and restraint – Massachusetts prohibits seclusion, but not restraint;
3. what training, what level of certification, how are they recertified, how are they trained, employees must be trained and hold a current certificate or they can endanger themselves and others during an intervention;
4. how different is physical restraint from reasonable physical force as allowed in the School Code, and how is a child moved;
5. never use seclusion or restraint for someone who has been physically or sexually abused, or has a history of self-injury or suicide, how do we know when someone is suicidal, seclusion rooms in some schools are not safe environments because they may contain items that can be used to commit suicide;
6. suggests there should be physician review within 30 minutes of seclusion as in mental health;
7. seclusion is not allowed to continue for more than ten minutes, but it could happen seven times per day; is there a total time limit per day;
8. The Revised School Code Section 1312, (4) implies that a volunteer or a contractor could be alone with a student and use reasonable physical force;
9. The Revised School Code Section 1312, (4)(e) with regard to obtaining control of a weapon or other dangerous object, law enforcement should be contacted;
10. The Revised School Code is more permissive than the proposed policy would be;

11. concern regarding restraint and putting children in a room by themselves;
12. how do you find the middle ground of protecting everyone without allowing seclusion and restraint;
13. what type of training is normally in place at intermediate school districts – there are currently no standards in place for the training, there are vendors of training, and certificates achieved by demonstrating competencies through training; training requirements could be proposed in legislation;
14. the strategic directive that will be presented to the Board at a future date will ask Department staff to develop a specific plan for training;
15. craft a policy that is inclusive, then work to create capacity within school districts and the School Code;
16. two points missing in the policy include: (1) do not use chemical restraints, and (2) as part of Positive Behavior Support provide training to identify the antecedents of the behavior;
17. need to have a policy, and determine to what extent the Board would make recommendations for the revision of the School Code;
18. need for empirical study, and cost/benefit analysis, in order to make data driven decisions; these also need to be presented to the Legislature stating that the present cost of not having a policy is too high in terms of injury to students and staff – one of the strategic directives is a data piece; currently there is no formal data collection system to determine what is taking place in schools;
19. training ties into teacher preparation programs;
20. we have data from 103 schools in Michigan's statewide initiative that have adopted Positive Behavior Supports; and
21. does Universal Education have as a building block Positive Behavior Support.

Mrs. Straus invited public comment on seclusion and restraint before board member comments continued:

1. Mr. Mark McWilliams, 4095 Legacy Parkway, #500, Lansing, Michigan 48910. Mr. McWilliams, representing Michigan Protection and Advocacy Services, provided comments and written information.
2. Mr. Norman DeLisle, Jr., 780 West Lake Lansing Road, Suite 200, East Lansing, Michigan 48823. Mr. DeLisle, Director, Michigan Disability Rights Coalition, provided comments and written information.
3. Mr. Dohn Hoyle, 1325 South Washington Blvd., Lansing, Michigan 48910. Mr. Hoyle, Executive Director, The ARC Michigan, shared oral and written comments.
4. Mr. Mark Moody, 3438 Silver Springs Place, Mt. Pleasant, Michigan 48858. Mr. Moody, representing, Michigan Association of Administrators of Special Education, shared comments.
5. Mr. Robert Dietiker, 16170 Tiverton Court, Northville, Michigan 48167. Mr. Dietiker, Director of Student Services, Livonia Public Schools, provided comments.
6. Ms. Tiffiany Leischner, 100 West Washtenaw, Lansing, Michigan. Ms. Leischner, representing Association for Children's Mental Health, provided comments.
7. Ms. Judy Hutchins, 7460 U.S. 23 South, Ossineke, Michigan 49766. Ms. Hutchins, President, National Alliance for the Mentally III – Michigan Chapter, shared comments.
8. Ms. Lora Durham, 1641 Roosevelt, Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197. Ms. Durham provided comments.

Board member comments and staff clarifications continued:

23. using systems that are currently in place, consider the following: (1) periodic review and the implementation of Universal Education principles including a deadline for visible integration throughout teacher preparation, and (2) linkage between teacher preparation/professional development and student outcomes; teacher certification

process/licensing renewal and measurement tool to determine teacher preparedness on this topic;

24. ban seclusion immediately and reinforce concepts in teacher training and professional development;
25. ban seclusion and restraint; and concentrate on Positive Behavior Support; perhaps intermediate school districts could assist;
26. ban seclusion entirely;
27. tighten time out definitions so that it can not become seclusion de facto;
28. institute Positive Behavior Support training in teacher preparation programs and in ongoing professional learning in the community;
29. clarify what would constitute restraint under any policy; we do have the School Code with the reasonable physical force and we have to do some clarification of what is allowed under the School Code which would be a legislative initiative;
30. in the event that intervention is conducted in a building (because things happen) there has to be incident reporting, and the State Department of Education has to get those incident reports; the State Department of Education should, as they have to in mental health and in child caring institutions, have to submit their reports to the independent protection and advocacy system in the State, so that there would be somebody who is watching trends from outside who can come in and take a look at what is going on;
31. involve the general public in the review of the policy – referent group included representation from the Michigan Education Association and Michigan Federation of Teachers, and comments were solicited from the general public;
32. would there be unintended consequences if seclusion were not used, and restraint were tightly limited; need policy that is tightly defined; emphasize preventive approach; need for school wide Positive Behavior Support;
33. time out should be defined;

34. Board would provide leadership and help fashion legislation;
35. support preventive approach minimizing number of occasions when seclusion or restraint can be used; data collection in proposed policy could be more prescriptive regarding information to be collected; appropriate training is necessary;
36. restraint and physical force seem to be the same, with the exception of property damage; Board could ask Legislature to eliminate the language regarding property damage as a basis for restraint in the School Code;
37. Positive Behavior Supports, seclusion and restraint, and Zero Tolerance issues are all related and should be part of the same discussions with the Legislature;

Mrs. Straus provided the following summary of Board member comments:

38. Emphasize the preventative approach;
39. Have a tightly defined policy supporting and strongly encouraging school districts and every school to have Positive Behavior Support policies, training, and practice;
40. Make current School Code language very clear;
41. Collect data; and
42. Define emergency very clearly in terms of the student's emergency and the student's day.

The Board will be asked to approve a revised document at a future meeting.

B. Update on Center for Educational Performance and Information

The following individual presented:

- Dr. Meg Ropp, Director, Center for Educational Performance and Information

Dr. Ropp provided an update and PowerPoint presentation on the primary functions of the Center for Educational Performance



and Information (CEPI) including the Educational Data Decision Support System.

Board member comments and Dr. Ropp's clarifications included:

1. need data to inform good policy; we are working to build a system that will track students after high school, collecting information on type of college attended, degree earned, job type, job location, and level of pay;
2. *concerns include:* multiple student codes, incorrect student data entry because of form complexity or length; tracking highly qualified teacher status; graduation rates and exit codes for dropouts; software programs that are being combined for CEPI to manage are causing data loss;  
  
*solutions provided by Dr. Ropp include:* comprehensive data manual, help desk, tutorials, professional development strand for data management being developed with professional organizations; the Registry of Educational Personnel (REP) has been revised to include necessary data to track highly qualified teacher status;
3. is server capacity an issue – no, more server capacity can be purchased; is data flexible – Single Record Student Database is being reviewed and updated, and the new system will have core data that is exchanged; is response time quick – yes;
4. the process is entering the data, connecting the data, and informing (getting the data out) – currently in the informing part of the cycle;
5. tracking students with regard to drop out status is based on five years of data collection;
6. relationship between CEPI and Department of Information Technology (DIT) – both are service organizations holding weekly meetings; monthly meetings are held with Michigan Department of Education, CEPI, and DIT Steering Committee; and
7. all Departments seem to be working well together to collect, manage, and distribute data.

IX. RECESS

The Board recessed the Committee of the Whole for lunch at 12:22 p.m. During lunch the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) Grants Unit staff demonstrated the new Michigan Grants Available List (MiGAL). MiGAL is a web based, searchable database of funding opportunities related to education or youth. It is designed for schools, higher education institutions, parents, and the general public to find education related funding opportunities. This will continue to provide information on the MDE grants process and how it is enhancing systems to better serve our customers.

The Regular Meeting reconvened at 1:30 p.m.

**REGULAR MEETING**

X. APPROVAL OF STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MINUTES

- A. Approval of Minutes of Committee of the Whole and Regular Meeting of February 14, 2006

**Mr. Austin moved, seconded by Mrs. Bauer, that the State Board of Education approve the Minutes of the Committee of the Whole and Regular Meeting of February 14, 2006.**

**Ayes: Austin, Bauer, Curtin, Danhof, McGuire, Straus  
Absent During Vote: Turner, Weiser**

**The motion carried.**

XI. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

- A. National Governors Association (NGA) Grant Update

Mrs. Straus said the Department has committed to and reports quarterly to the NGA Center on the following five grant requirements:

- High school graduation rates are reported annually
- We are moving to a cohort graduation rate
- The NGA leadership team includes representatives from the State Board of Education, the Governor's office, legislature, business, K-12, and postsecondary
- We annually share information with Standard and Poor's SchoolMatters.com
- The communication plan is under development

Mrs. Straus said NGA project activity on high school content expectations is proceeding on time and on budget, and content expectations for mathematics and English language arts will come to the Board for approval in April.

She said a draft document will be presented to the Board in April regarding dual enrollment. She said the goal is to develop policy in order to remove barriers to participation of minority and disadvantaged students in college-level learning opportunities with focus on high-priority schools.

B. University School in the Ferndale School District

Mrs. Straus said she visited University High School in the Ferndale School District on February 15, 2006. She said it is a partnership with Lawrence Technological University. She said it is a School of Choice and 80 per cent of the students are from Detroit. The school currently has 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> grades, and one grade will be added in each of the next two years for a total enrollment of 500 students. She said there is a strong relationship with the community, businesses, and alumni. She said she hopes students, faculty, and staff can present at a future Board meeting.

C. Round Table Discussion on Teacher Quality Issues

Mrs. Straus said she, Mrs. Danhof, Mrs. Weiser, Mr. Flanagan, and Dr. Flora Jenkins from the Office of Professional Preparation Services, participated in a Round Table Discussion on Teacher Quality Issues on February 24, 2006. She said the discussion was convened by Michigan State University Education Policy Center and University of Pennsylvania Consortium for Policy Research in Education, and it was a productive session that will inform future discussions on teacher certification issues.

D. Senate Education Hearings

Mrs. Straus said Board members continue to participate in the Senate Education Committee Public Hearings on High School Graduation Requirements.

E. High School Graduation Requirements Forums

Mrs. Straus said she and Mrs. McGuire participated in a Public Forum on High School Graduation Requirements hosted by Senator Martha Scott in Hamtramck on March 8; and she is participating in Forums on March 10 in Dearborn and March 20 in Detroit hosted by Senator Irma Clark-Coleman.

## XII. REPORT OF THE SUPERINTENDENT

### Reports

- E. Human Resources Report
- F. Report on the Washtenaw County Intermediate School District Plan for the Delivery of Special Education Programs and Services
- G. Report on Modifications to the Previously Approved Dickinson-Iron Intermediate School District Plan for the Delivery of Special Education Programs and Services
- H. Report on a Modification to the Previously Approved Ionia County Intermediate School District Plan for the Delivery of Special Education Programs and Services
- I. Report on Department of Education Cosponsorship

### Grants

- J. 2005-2006 Title II, Part A(1): Improving Teacher Quality State Activities Competitive Grant Program – Initial
- K. 2005-2006 Title I Technical Assistance Grant – Amendment
- L. 2005-2006 Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, Part B Formula Grants – Initial
- M. 2005-2006 Special Projects Grants Under Centers for Disease Control and Prevention – Amendment

## XIII. REPORT BY MICHIGAN TEACHER OF THE YEAR

Mr. Daniel Schab, 2005-2006 Michigan Teacher of the Year, presented Report by Michigan Teacher of the Year.

Mr. Schab said he continues to give his most popular presentation *Rigor, Relevance, and Relationships* to a number of school districts. He said it is tied to the high school graduation requirements. He said he has recently presented at Ionia Intermediate School District and Charlotte Public Schools.

He said he presented a three and one-half hour workshop at the Michigan Association for Computer Users in Learning (MACUL) Conference on technology in the classroom.

He said he gave the keynote speech on March 6 to 800 student teachers at Grand Valley State University, his alma mater. He said he presented a workshop for teachers of mathematics in the afternoon. He said nine colleges and universities were represented. He said he mentioned his fifth grade teacher in his keynote speech, and she contacted him and they have plans to meet for dinner.

XIV. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IN STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MEETING

- A. Dr. Susanne Chandler, Dean, University of Michigan Flint, 410 French Hall, Flint, Michigan 48502. Dr. Chandler, representing Michigan Deans Council, provided comments and written material regarding the Professional Standards Commission for Teachers.
- B. Dr. Dyanne Tracy, 485A Pawley Hall, Oakland University, Rochester, Michigan 48309. Dr. Tracy provided comments and written information regarding Oakland University's School of Education and Human Services receiving the 2006 Best Practice Award in Gender Equity from the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education.
- C. Mrs. Mary T. Wood, 27533 Santa Ana, Warren, Michigan 48093. Ms. Wood, representing Michigan Alliance for Charter School Reform, shared comments on public school academies and special education.
- D. Mr. George Wurtzel, 200 South Lafayette, Greenville, Michigan 48838. Mr. Wurtzel, Executive Director, Opportunities Unlimited for the Blind, shared comments regarding the sale of the former School for the Blind property in Lansing.

XV. RECESS

The Board recessed the Regular Meeting to reconvene the Committee of the Whole at 2:05 p.m.

**COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE MEETING**

XVI. DISCUSSION ITEMS (continued)

- C. Report on MEAP Statewide Results

The following individual presented:

- Dr. Ed Roeber, Senior Executive Director, Office of Educational Assessment and Accountability

Dr. Roeber presented information on the 2005-2006 MEAP and MI-Access statewide results at the elementary and middle school levels, based on the performance standards approved by the Board at its January 2006 meeting. The results show the performance of students in all content areas and at all grade levels assessed by each program.

Board member comments included:

1. how is listening tested – students listen to an audio tape, and answer multiple choice questions in the test booklet;
2. how many years before scores can be compared – three years;
3. Grade Level Content Expectations in English Language Arts, grades K-8, have been in place since 2004. There appears to be a writing decline; was there a significant change in requirements for writing and is there a relationship between implementation in the classroom and testing – assessment is more demanding because a second writing prompt has been added, and writing tasks are challenging;
5. there are good scores in elementary school, why do math grades drop off in middle school – the Department needs to address this dramatic drop off which is more significant for black and Hispanic students; and
6. are there any variances among large urban school districts, some school buildings are doing better than others, look at differences at the district level that may drive policy or practice recommendations.

XVII. ADJOURNMENT

The Board adjourned the Committee of the Whole at 2:27 p.m. and reconvened the Regular Meeting at 2:38 p.m.

**REGULAR MEETING**

XVIII. APPROVAL OF PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS COMMISSION FOR TEACHERS

Dr. Flora Jenkins, Director, Office of Professional Preparation Services, presented Approval of Proposed Changes to the Professional Standards Commission for Teachers.

**Mrs. Danhof moved, seconded by Mr. Austin, that the State Board of Education approve the Proposed Changes to the Professional Standards Commission for Teachers, as discussed in the Superintendent's memorandum dated February 27, 2006.**

Dr. Jenkins said the Office of Professional Preparation Services has responded to the requests of the State Board of Education to review and improve the composition and procedures of the Professional Standards Commission for Teachers, which advises the Board on standards and matters concerning teacher preparation and licensing. The revised charge, composition, and framework for Commission action are being submitted for Board approval.

Mrs. Bauer said page two, (b), should state career and technical education rather than vocational education for consistency throughout the document.

Mrs. Weiser said she sent a communication to Board members requesting the appointment of five global members rather than three. She said the voices of employers need to be heard.

Mrs. Danhof said she is not in favor of five global members or 14 members from the teachers group. She said it is important to have one person representing each area for the sake of continuity. She said if there are too many representatives in one group, members may not see the importance of attendance at all meetings.

Mrs. Danhof said page three, number 7, should read "periodic review process for teacher preparation institutions."

Mrs. McGuire said meetings will not be closed, so other points of view can be represented through comment and representation.

Dr. Jeremy Hughes, Chief Academic Officer, said this group sets the standards that result in the tests that determine who gets certified. He said it is important that teachers be in the majority on the Commission.

Dr. Hughes said the Periodic Review Council is responsible for recommending whether or not institutions should be approved in various subject areas. He said they recommend professional development for teachers, and how to engage the community in determining whether or not teacher preparation programs are producing the needed teachers. He said the process is being revised so that Board member concerns are included.

Mrs. Weiser asked what groups will be notified regarding nomination of community members. Dr. Jenkins said several groups will be notified.

Mrs. Weiser asked that Board members receive a listing of the organizations, and she suggested that members of the high school redesign committee should be included.

Mr. Austin said everyone has a stake in the quality of teaching, and if teachers comprise the majority of the commission he cautions against the notion of protecting and defending the way we have always done things. He said he is open minded regarding changing the composition of the group.

Mrs. Curtin said she believes the number is not that important, and that appointees to the commission will take their obligation seriously and faithfully attend the meetings.

Mr. Turner asked if the commission size is too large. Dr. Hughes said he believes it is too large.

Mr. Austin said the Board has had discussions regarding the charge of the Professional Standards Commission for Teachers, as stated in the document. He said it is the intention that the Commission would be proactive in helping the Board reshape and improve teacher preparation and teacher education globally.

**Mr. Austin offered an amendment, seconded by Mrs. Weiser, that the number of members representing teachers on the Professional Standards Commission for Teachers be reduced from 14 to 12.**

Mrs. Weiser said she is looking for a product that is progressive.

Mr. Turner said he agrees with the need for a proactive catalyst of change for the Commission.

The vote was taken on the amendment.

**Ayes: Austin, Bauer, Curtin, Danhof, Straus, Turner, Weiser**  
**Nay: McGuire**

**The amendment carried.**

The vote was taken on the motion, as amended.

**Ayes: Austin, Bauer, Curtin, Danhof, Straus, Turner, Weiser**  
**Nay: McGuire**

**The amended motion carried.**

Mr. Austin left the meeting at 3:00 p.m.



XIX. APPOINTMENT OF A COMMITTEE OF SCHOLARS TO REVIEW THE COLLEGE FOR CREATIVE STUDIES' APPLICATION TO BECOME A TEACHER PREPARATION INSTITUTION

Dr. Flora Jenkins, Director, Office of Professional Preparation Services; Dr. Catherine Smith, Supervisor, Office of Professional Preparation Services; and Ms. Sue Wittick, Consultant, Office of Professional Preparation Services; presented Appointment of a Committee of Scholars to Review the College for Creative Studies' Application to Become a Teacher Preparation Institution.

Dr. Jenkins said the College for Creative Studies is ready to submit an application for probationary approval as a teacher preparation institution. She said a Committee of Scholars is needed to review the application, visit the institution, and make recommendations regarding approval.

Mrs. Straus said previously the Board approved a moratorium on granting preliminary approval to institutions for the initial preparation of teachers to extend from August 9, 2005, through July 30, 2008. She said at that time it was clarified that the moratorium does not include institutions currently in the pipeline.

Mrs. Straus said she will not be voting since she was President of the Center for Creative Studies fifteen years ago.

Mrs. McGuire asked how this program is different from the Wayne State University program. Ms. Wittick said the College for Creative Studies will only prepare visual arts teachers, and because of the focus on the arts it will prepare very good visual arts teachers. Ms. Wittick said twenty institutions currently prepare art teachers. Dr. Smith said this is the only institution in the state that has one content area as its focus, so there is the possibility for a lot of rigor in this program.

Mrs. Danhof asked why another program is needed, if twenty institutions currently prepare art teachers. Dr. Smith said it is in line with our democracy's entrepreneurial spirit. Dr. Jenkins said staff has reviewed the program and believes it will prepare quality teachers.

Mr. Turner asked if the pedagogical perspective, would a school that has its primary orientation as the arts have enough rigor in the core content areas? He said perhaps there should be collaboration with other institutions in this climate of limited funding for higher education institutions. Dr. Smith said these concerns and others will be addressed by the proposed Committee of Scholars.

Mrs. Straus said the College for Creative Studies has a very good liberal arts program.

Mrs. Bauer said as we add institutions of higher education offering teacher preparation programs, we need to consider how to work with them to intervene as the teacher certification process is modified.

There was discussion regarding diversity and qualifications of the proposed Committee of Scholars.

**Mrs. Curtin moved, seconded by Mrs. Weiser, that the State Board of Education approve the appointment of Timothy Brisbois, Susanne Chandler, William Charland, Diane Joslin-Gould, and Karen Obsniuk as the Committee of Scholars for the review of the College for Creative Studies' application for approval as a teacher preparation institution.**

The vote was taken on the motion.

**Ayes: Curtin, Turner, Weiser**  
**Nays: Bauer, Danhof, McGuire**  
**Abstain: Straus**  
**Absent: Austin**

The motion failed.

Mrs. Weiser said the current teacher certification system is not where we hope it will be in the next six months.

Mr. Turner said the overall process for teacher preparation is under discussion and the school would be evaluated on the basis of success or failure at the end of the process.

Mrs. Bauer said she understood that schools in the pipeline would not necessarily receive approval, but rather be evaluated on their level of success or failure at each step in the process.

Mrs. Danhof said it was her understanding that the schools in the pipeline were going to be heard and not automatically approved. She said she is accepting her obligation to vote for or against approval. She said she does not want to wait until the last step in the process to vote no, because precious time and resources would be wasted by the institution.

Mrs. Carnell said she would appreciate it if committees would be diverse, so that everyone can have the benefit of a full rich discussion of a diverse group.

Mrs. Weiser said she would treat the programs in the pipeline the same as those that have already been approved. She said this means that all of them will be subject to the new developments that occur as a result of the Board's discussions regarding teacher certification.

Mrs. Straus said this will be a topic of discussion at the next agenda planning meeting, and staff will be notified regarding the next steps.

XX. APPROVAL OF PROCESS TO FINALIZE THE SOCIAL STUDIES GRADE LEVEL CONTENT EXPECTATIONS

Dr. Yvonne Caamal Canul, Director, Office of School Improvement; and Dr. Jeremy Hughes, Deputy Superintendent and Chief Academic Officer; presented Approval of Process to Finalize the Social Studies Grade Level Content Expectations.

Dr. Caamal Canul said the Social Studies Task Force presented the Social Studies Grade Level Content Expectations to the Board for approval in July 2005. At that meeting the Board directed staff to seek a national review, and recommendations were returned by Dr. John Patrick in December 2005. Dr. Caamal Canul offered a PowerPoint presentation explaining the protocol process of curriculum development. She said the Social Studies Task Force has fulfilled its function, and it should be disbanded. Dr. Hughes said the Department is grateful for the work of the Task Force.

**Mrs. Danhof moved, seconded by Mrs. Bauer, that the State Board of Education recognize the foundational work done by the Social Studies Task Force in advancing rigorous learning expectations in the social studies and for providing a forum for deliberate discussion about strategies for increasing student achievement, as discussed in the Superintendent's memorandum dated March 9, 2006.**

Mrs. Curtin asked when the Grade Level Content Expectations will be ready for schools. Dr. Hughes said if the proposed process is followed as presented, they will be ready for teachers to use in September.

The vote was taken on the motion.

**Ayes: Bauer, Curtin, Danhof, McGuire, Straus, Turner, Weiser**  
**Absent: Austin**

**The motion carried.**

**Mrs. McGuire moved, seconded by Mrs. Danhof, that the State Board of Education officially disband the Social Studies Task Force that was formed in June of 2004, as discussed in the Superintendent's memorandum dated March 9, 2006.**

The vote was taken on the motion.

**Ayes: Bauer, Curtin, Danhof, McGuire, Straus, Turner, Weiser  
Absent: Austin**

**The motion carried.**

**Mrs. Bauer moved, seconded by Mrs. McGuire, that the State Board of Education direct the Department to revise, when deemed necessary, the Social Studies Standards and Benchmarks in order to identify grade level content expectations that meet national rigor and to proceed with the process to finalize the document according to established protocol.**

There was discussion regarding concerns in meeting the August 2006 deadline for completion of final documents.

Mrs. Weiser said it should be done well, and expediently, being realistic about workload.

Dr. Caamal Canul said she believes the motion means slight adjustments to the standards based on the national review.

**Ayes: Bauer, Curtin, Danhof, McGuire, Straus, Turner, Weiser  
Absent: Austin**

**The motion carried.**

Ms. Kelli Sweet, representing the Michigan Council for Social Studies, offered comments.

## **XXI. STATE AND FEDERAL EDUCATION LEGISLATION UPDATE**

Mr. Robert Morris, Legislative Director; and Ms. Roberta Stanley, Director, Administrative Law and Federal Relations; presented State and Federal Education Legislation Update.

Mr. Morris distributed a Legislative Update dated March 14, 2006. He reviewed the current legislation on high school graduation requirements and said the legislation is moving ahead in the House and Senate.

Ms. Stanley reviewed federal funding issues including the fiscal year 2007 budget, e-Rate reform, and Council of Chief State School Officers No Child Left Behind Task Force on the Reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Ms. Stanley said she, Mrs. Straus, Mrs. McGuire, and Mrs. Danhof will be traveling to Washington, D.C. on March 15-17, 2006, to attend the National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE) Legislative Conference.

Mrs. Bauer said cuts in Medicaid greatly impact schools. Ms. Stanley said she will be attending a meeting on the issue.

Ms. Carnell left the meeting at 4:45 p.m.

This was an update only and no action was taken.

XXII. APPROVAL OF STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION STRATEGIC GOAL AND PRIORITIES

Mrs. Straus presented Approval of State Board of Education Strategic Goal and Priorities.

Mrs. Straus said at the Board Retreat held on January 26-27, 2006, there was consensus to retain the current Strategic Goal which is to attain substantial and meaningful improvement in academic achievement for all students/children with primary emphasis on high priority schools and students.

Mrs. Straus the Board also identified four priorities for the coming months including:

- Continue to advocate and promote high school reform;
- Create a subcommittee to address the process of oversight and evaluation of State Board policies and procedures;
- Review of teacher preparation and certification process; and
- Continue to work on solidifying the relationship between and among State Board of Education, Michigan Department of Education, and Intermediate School Districts.

**Mrs. Bauer moved, seconded by Mrs. Curtin, that the State Board of Education (1) reiterate its Strategic Goal and approve the four priorities as listed in the President's memorandum dated March 8, 2006, and (2) direct the Superintendent to develop a revised State Board of Education/Department of Education Strategic Plan incorporating the priorities.**

**Ayes: Bauer, Curtin, Danhof, McGuire, Straus, Turner, Weiser  
Absent: Austin**

**The motion carried.**

**XXIII. APPROVAL OF STATE EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY PLAN**

Ms. Mary Ann Chartrand, Director, Office of Grants Coordination and School Support Services; Mr. Louis Burgess, Supervisor, Grants Administration and Coordination, Office of Grants Coordination and School Support Services; Ms. Barbara Fardell, Consultant, Office of Grants Coordination and School Support Services; presented Approval of State Educational Technology Plan.

This item was removed from the consent agenda and placed under discussion.

**Mrs. Bauer moved, seconded by Mr. Turner that the State Board of Education approve the State of Michigan Educational Technology Plan, March 2006.**

Mrs. Danhof requested a definition of broadband internet access be included in the document, for funding purposes. Mr. Burgess said it is defined as high-speed internet access currently offered through four mediums including cable, digital subscriber line, satellite, and wireless.

Mrs. Danhof said a revision should be made on page 20 to state substantially rather than at least double the current state-level funding.

Mrs. Danhof said it is important to understand the online learning environments and changes that are necessary in pedagogy and class structure and addressing individual learning styles and needs. She said number 2 on page 15 should be clarified.

Mrs. Danhof said on page 10, data-driven decision making, there should be an expectation for educators to foster in students the ability to make data-driven decisions. Ms. Fardell said it may belong under professional learning.

**Mrs. Bauer and Mr. Turner agreed to include the abovementioned changes in the document being recommended for approval.**

The vote was taken on the motion.

**Ayes: Bauer, Curtin, Danhof, McGuire, Straus, Turner, Weiser  
Absent: Austin**

**The motion carried.**

**XXIV. CONSENT AGENDA**

**Criteria**

- R. Approval of Criteria for the 2005-06 Enhancing Education Through Technology – Category III – Comprehensive K-12 Data Management and Student Data Tracking System
- S. Approval of Criteria for a Grant for Dispute Resolution Under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA 2004)

**Approvals**

- T. Approval of Statewide English Language Proficiency Assessment for English Language Learners
- U. Approval of State Educational Technology Plan – moved to discussion

**Mr. Turner moved, seconded by Mrs. Curtin, that the State Board of Education approve the Consent Agenda, as follows:**

- R. **approve the criteria for the 2005-06 Enhancing Education Through Technology – Category III – Comprehensive K-12 Data Management and Student Data Tracking System grant program, as attached to the Superintendent’s memorandum dated February 27, 2006;**
- S. **approve criteria for a grant for Dispute Resolution under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA 2004), as identified in the Superintendent’s memorandum dated February 27, 2006;**
- T. **approve the English Language Proficiency Assessment for English language learners which includes updates to the Assessment Accommodations Table, as described in the Superintendent’s memorandum dated March 7, 2006; and**

- U. (This item has been removed from the consent agenda and placed under discussion items.)

The vote was taken on the motion.

**Ayes: Bauer, Curtin, Danhof, McGuire, Straus, Turner, Weiser**  
**Absent: Austin**

**The motion carried.**

XXV. COMMENTS BY STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION MEMBERS

There were no additional comments by State Board of Education members.

XXVI. TENTATIVE AGENDA FOR NEXT MEETING

Board members are asked to submit agenda topics for future meetings to the agenda planning committee comprised of Mrs. Straus, Mr. Austin, and Mrs. Curtin.

XXVII. FUTURE MEETING DATES

- A. April 11, 2006
- B. May 9, 2006
- C. June 13, 2006
- D. July 11, 2006

There was discussion regarding the July meeting date, and it was determined that a decision to move the date would be made in the future.

XXVIII. ADJOURNMENT

The Regular Meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Carolyn L. Curtin  
Secretary